

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 23 and 25 are now pending in the application. Minor amendments have been made to the specification and claims to simply overcome the objections to the specification and rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112. The amendments to the claims contained herein are intended to broaden the scope thereof and/or are of equivalent scope as originally filed and, thus, are not a narrowing amendment. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the interview granted on September 29, 2005. During the interview, the reference to Kalinowski and independent claim 1 was discussed. During the interview, no agreement was reached as to the allowability of claims, however, the Examiner indicated that reconsideration of the present claims in light of the current amendments and arguments would be made.

SPECIFICATION

Although the Applicant submits that no new matter was added to the specification in the prior amendments, as support in the art for the amendments made were referenced in the application as filed and the supporting documents were provided. Nevertheless, the Applicant has deleted the amendments previously made to the specification to expedite the prosecution of the present application. The Applicant does not disavow or relinquish subject matter in the previous amendments, this amendment really is made to expedite the prosecution of the present application.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-7, 23 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s) at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 1-7, and 23 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which application regards as the invention.

Regarding the mixture recited in independent claim 1, the Applicant submits that the mixture is a product formed as a process of mixing the first two compositional elements. Although the claim is not directed towards a method of making the mixture, the mixture itself is a composition or product of the mixture of the other components. Therefore, the Applicant submits that the claim is clear as it stands and is supported by the application as filed.

In regards to the various other rejections, the claims have been amended in a non-narrowing manner to overcome the rejections.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-7, 25 and 23 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kalinowski (U.S. Pat. No. 5,129,919). The mixture of co. 7, lines 51-68 reads on the claimed composite. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Applicant requests reconsideration of the claims as pending. The cited art is directed towards a material for making a ceramic product, such as a ceramic abrasive wheel or a bonded abrasive material. Generally, the products disclosed in the prior art are made of a slurry material that is sintered or formed into a final product shape or form. In particular, as described in Kalinowski, the sol gel that is formed into filaments which are then dried and sintered. (See col. 2, lines 49-58.) As described throughout Kalinowski, various filaments are formed that are then bonded together to form products, such as grinding wheels, sharpening stones and the like. Therefore, Kalinowski is specifically directed towards only using a sol gel to form a fiber, that is formed through extrusion or spinning, that can then be sintered and bonded into a grinding wheel. Contrary to this, independent claim 1 recites, "a ceramic fiber; a sol gel...alumina particles; wherein the sol gel is mixed with said alumina particles...wherein the mixture of the sol gel and the alumina particles surround the ceramic fiber." Applicant submits that Kalinowski et al. does not teach or suggest each of these elements of independent claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 1, and each of the claims that depend directly or indirectly therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

Carman et al. is also directed towards forming a device, such as a grinding wheel, through the infiltration into a foam where the foam is then burnt out during a firing or sintering process. Therefore, Carman et al. is also directed towards a specific application of making a grinding wheel rather than a ceramic composite, as recited in independent claim 1. As discussed above, independent claim 1 recites the ceramic fiber, a sol gel, alumina particles, wherein the mixture of the sol gel and the alumina particles surrounds the ceramic fiber. Carmen et al. does not teach or suggest, either

alone or in combination with the other cited art, each of the elements of the presently pending claims. Therefore, independent claim 1 is in condition for allowance in light of the cited art.

Therefore, the Applicant requests the Examiner reconsider the prior arguments and these arguments included herein and allow each of the presently pending claims. In particular, because none of the cited art, either alone or in combination, anticipates each of the elements of the presently pending claims.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10/16/2005

By: 

Michael L. Taylor, Reg. No. 50,521

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDE/MLT/jb